

REMARKS

In response to the above Advisory Action and the Examiner's continued rejection of claims 4-7 over Robinett, claims 4-7 have been cancelled to reduce the issues in this case.

However, claims 1-3 have been retained because it is not believed they are obvious over Habisohn in view of Feddema and Bose for the reasons discussed below, and, therefore, they have been retained. The withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as set forth in the Office Action of August 25, 2009 in view of the Amendment filed November 24, 2009 is appreciated. A minor amendment has been made to claim 2 to correct a typographical error.

In the Advisory Action the Examiner maintains that relative to claims 1-3, Feddema teaches that the parameters of the filter take into account effects of the performance of the crane unit such as acceleration or velocity of the crane, citing column 13, line 44 to column 14, line 8 of the reference, and, therefore, that it would be obvious to use the filter of Feddema in the method of Habisohn for controlling a crane.

Applicants carefully reviewed this disclosure in Feddema and would like to point out the following.

This disclosure in Feddema only relates to the control of the velocity of the crane and the commanded acceleration of the crane is given by equation (3). It does not teach the technical feature of the present invention of a filter unit for removing a component near a resonance frequency from a transportation command for the load, in which command a maximum value among at least one of a transportation speed, transportation acceleration, and transportation jerk is limited. See claim 1, lines 6-9;; claim 2, lines 17-26; and claims 3, lines 5-8.

In other words, the claimed invention includes the feature that the commands outputted from the filter do not exceed the upper limits of the performance of the crane drive unit. Thus, the present invention can control the crane so as to sufficiently suppress the sway of the load suspended from the rope.

This feature is in all of claims 1-3 and is not shown in Feddema. Thus it is not seen how claims 1-3 can be considered to be obvious over Habishohn in view of Feddema. As noted in the reply of November 24, 2009, Habisohn may relate to a method for controlling a crane, but it does not teach the features of the claimed filter unit. The same can be said of Bose. Accordingly, since Feddema does not either, it is submitted that the Examiner has not articulated sufficient reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious, because merely modifying the teachings of Habisohn with the teachings of Feddema does not arrive at the claimed invention. See M.P.E.P. §§2142 and 2143.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3 over the cited combination of references and its withdrawal and allowance of the claims is therefore requested.

An RCE is being filed simultaneously with this Response.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 22, 2010

By: 

Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338
(202) 408-4091